



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/625,673 | 07/24/2003 | Naohiro Yoshikawa | 03560.002263.1 | 8897 |

5514 7590 05/19/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

GARCIA, GABRIEL I

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/625,673

Applicant(s)

YOSHIKAWA, NAOHIRO

Examiner

Gabriel I. Garcia

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/172,673.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. With regard to IDS filed on 12/23/04, references have been considered, but 1449 was not included in the papers filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "which indicates that paper is fed from the lower end of an envelope" is vague and indefinite, it is not clear whether it is referring to the position of the envelope being fed or whether it is referring to the way the envelope is being fed. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 17, 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stone (5,080,509).

With regard to claim 17, Stone teaches a printing control apparatus (figs 1-12) comprising: a determining unit for determining whether a designated type of paper is an envelope (e.g. col. 6, lines 56-64 and col. 8, lines 1-42); and an operating unit (148) for

Art Unit: 2624

issuing a command for printing operation (reads on fig. 11) an image along a paper feed direction (e.g. col. 3, lines 55-61) when said determining unit determines that the designated type of paper is not an envelope (e.g. col. 8, lines 1-42), and for issuing a command for printing a reverse image along the paper feed direction when said determining unit determining that the designated type of paper is an envelope (e.g. col. 2, lines 57-64, col. 5, line 45 thru col. 6, line 12).

With regard to claims 20 and 23, the limitations of claims 20 and 23 are covered by the limitations of claim 18 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 18-19, 21-22 and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone (5,080,509) in view of Ryuichi (JPO 04130963).

With regard to claim 18, Stone teaches a printing control apparatus (figs 1-12) comprising: a determining unit for determining whether a designated type of paper is an envelope (e.g. col. 6, lines 56-64 and col. 8, lines 1-42); and inherently teaches means for displaying (reads on col. 1, lines 19-27) and paper feeding from the lower end of an envelope when said determining that the designated type of paper is an envelop (e.g.

Art Unit: 2624

col. 2, lines 57-64, col. 5, line 45 thru col. 6, line 12). Stone does not explicitly teach displaying the information that indicates that paper is fed from the lower end of an envelope. Ryuichi (in the same field of endeavor, "printing of information") that it is well known in the art to display the information that indicates that paper is fed from the lower end of an envelope (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the system of Stone having sensors to detect envelope feeding with the means to display the feeding as described by Ryuichi because of the following reasons: 1) allow the user(s) of the system of Stone to view the feeding process of the system, thereby displaying the feeding setting direction as suggested by Ryuichi (see abstract); 2) allow the user(s) of the system of Stone to view information as to the processing of print job; and 3) allow the user(s) of the system of Stone to be more user friendly allowing the user to view information as to the processing of print job.

With regard to claim 19, the combination of Stone and Ryuichi teaches the displaying of setting information, and Stone further teaches that the envelope can be fed in different direction (e.g. col. 5, lines 5-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the system of Stone having sensors to detect envelope feeding and feeding envelopes in different directions with the means to display the feeding as described by Ryuichi because of the following reasons: 1) allow the user(s) of the system of Stone to view the feeding process of the system, thereby displaying the feeding setting direction as suggested by Ryuichi (see abstract); 2) allow the user(s) of the system of Stone to view information as to the processing of print job;

Art Unit: 2624

and 3) allow the user(s) of the system of Stone to be more user friendly allowing the user to view information as to the feeding process of print job.

With regard to claims 21-22 and 24-25, the limitations of claims 21-22 and 24-25 are covered by the limitations of claims 18-19 above.

With regard to claims 26-27, the limitations of claims 26-27 are covered by the limitations of claims 18 and 19 above; Stone teaches determining unit for determining whether a designated paper should be printed in a reverse feeding direction and setting the paper or envelope (e.g. col. 2, lines 57-64, col. 5, line 5 thru col. 6, line 12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the system of Stone having sensors to detect envelope feeding and feeding envelopes in different directions with the means to display the feeding as described by Ryuichi because of the following reasons: 1) allow the user(s) of the system of Stone to view the feeding process of the system, thereby displaying the feeding setting direction as suggested by Ryuichi (see abstract); 2) allow the user(s) of the system of Stone to view information as to the printing process of the envelope in different directions; and 3) allow the user(s) of the system of Stone to be more user friendly allowing the user to view information as to the feeding process of print job.

With regard to claims 28-31, the limitations of claims 28-31 are covered by the limitations of claims 18-19 and 26-27 above.

Conclusion


Art Unit: 2624

7. Applicant's arguments, filed 12/23/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 17-31 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection(s) has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection has been made in view of newly found prior art..

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Gabriel I. Garcia** whose telephone number is (571) 272-7434. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 7:30 AM-6:00 PM. The fax phone number for official or informal faxes for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Gabriel I. Garcia
Primary Examiner
May 16, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Gabriel Garcia". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "G" and a cursive "Garcia".

GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER